

PATENT

BBUCP101USA

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

Date: 2009-05-22

/Eric Jorgenson, Reg.# 46,002/
Eric D. Jorgenson

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of:

Appellant: Brett J. Buchanan

Serial No: 10/752,898

Filing Date: January 6, 2004

Examiner: Steven N. Leff

Art Unit: 1761

Title: EDIBLE PET TOY

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT
APPEAL BRIEF DATED APRIL 23, 2009**

Dear Sir:

Appellant submits this amended brief in response to the above Notification to bring the Brief into compliance as requested in the Notification.

I. Real Party in Interest (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(i))

The real party in interest in the present appeal is Brett J. Buchanan, appellant of the present application.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))

Appellant and appellant's legal representatives are not aware of any appeals or interferences which will directly affect, or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. Status of Claims (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21-23, and 25-27 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, and 24 have been cancelled. The rejection of claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21-23, and 25-27 is appealed.

IV. Status of Amendments (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))

No claim amendments have been made after the final rejection dated August 6, 2008.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(v))

The subject embodiments relate to an edible toy and method of making the same. The edible toy provides entertainment and nourishment and/or enjoyment to an animal, such as a cat. The edible toy includes a shell 102 that provides oral interaction with the animal (as in independent claim 1). The shell 102 can include an edible material and catnip for stimulation of the cat to interact therewith (as in independent claim 10) for maintaining freshness of underlying material and that gradually wears away as the cat interacts therewith (as in independent claim 19). (See, e.g., FIG. 1 and FIG. 2; page 4, lines 6-11.)

One or more underlying layers 104, 106, 108, 202, 204 formed of an edible material encased by the shell and the toy is edible in its entirety (as in independent claim 1, 10, and 19). The underlying layer(s) can include a layer binding material that provides consistency to retain

form and the edible material includes catnip (as in independent claims 1, 10, and 19). The binding material releases layer materials upon penetration (as in independent claims 1 and 19). (See, e.g., FIG. 1 and FIG. 2; page 4, lines 23–page 6, line 3.)

In the subject embodiments, the edible material is accessed by biting or clawing of the shell by the cat, to expose the underlying layer(s) underneath. The edible material can include an inducement, a nutrient, or a treatment, and can be in the form of a liquid, a gel, a paste, or one or more edible objects. (See, e.g., page 4, line 28 through page 5, line 6.) Multiple underlying layers can provide a plurality of different edible materials, and these multiple layers can be formed concentrically about a core material.

In various aspects, the shell can include an edible nodule or a string affixed thereto. (See, e.g., page 6, lines 6–17; page 7, lines 7–18.) The shell can also include one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material therethrough to the cat. The shell can be flexible such that distortion thereof by the cat causes the inner edible material to be released to the cat. Further, the shell can be compressed to a compression parameter for a particular type of animal such that a lower compression parameter facilitates easier access to the edible material and a higher compression parameter facilitates more difficult access to the edible material. (See, e.g., page 8, lines 14–24.)

An additional aspect relates to a method of providing an edible toy for an animal, and includes providing an edible material and providing a binding material that provides consistency to retain form. Mixing the edible material and binding material is performed to fashion a homogeneous mixture of an inducement and at least one of a nutrient or a treatment. An outer shell is formed for housing the homogenous mixture, and the edible material is encased within the outer shell (as in independent claim 21). (See, e.g., FIG. 10; page 10, lines 3–26.) The mixing of the edible material can be performed such that a mixture of edible components exhibits a marbling effect.

In view of the aforementioned aspects, the subject embodiments provide an edible toy that provides a cat with nutrition in addition to enjoyment. Such a device is not evident from the prior art, particularly that relied upon during prosecution.

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))

- A. Whether claim 5 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.
- B. Whether claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 19, 21-23, 25, and 27 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fisher (U.S. 4,260,635) in view of Smith (U.S. 1,022,113).
- C. Whether claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 21-23, 26, and 27 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Baikie (U.S. 6,238,715) in view of Smith (U.S. 1,022,113).

VII. Argument (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))

- A. Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This issue was raised in the Final Rejection, not in previous prosecution, and is editorial in nature. The language at issue will be corrected upon favorable reconsideration of the rejections under prior art.

- B. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 19, 21-23, 25, and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 19, 21-23, 25, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Smith. Reversal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

- i. **Fisher and Smith, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 10, 19, and 21 and claims 2, 5-9, 13, 22-23, 25, and 27, which depend therefrom respectively; therefore, Fisher and Smith do not render unpatentable the present claims to one ordinarily skilled in the art.**
- ii. **The combination of Fisher and Smith is unmotivated and fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103.**

iii. The combination of Fisher and Smith is rebutted by evidence of commercial success and also evidence of long-felt need in the marketplace for the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner relies on the structure of Fisher and Smith to reject the subject claims. However, the structure described in Fisher and Smith does not disclose or suggest the structure claimed in the present invention. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, 35 U.S.C. §103 requires that the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. See MPEP §706.02(j). The *teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination* and the reasonable expectation of success *must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure*. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added).

Fisher discloses a pet feeding system for providing food to a dog while providing sufficient exercise for the dog's teeth, gums and jaws, and also having unit-integrity and product "chew life." (See, e.g., col. 4, lines 1-11.) Fisher's pet feeding system includes an outer layer of a high chew-resistance and an inner layer of lesser or no chew-resistance. A number of alternating hard and soft layers *ad infinitum* can be included to meet the chewing demands of a dog. (See, e.g., col. 4, lines 40-50.) The layers are formed from food materials mixed together with safely digestible structure-supporting fibers from animal tissue such as skin, muscles, intestines, etc., from animals, for example from tendons, and animal hides such as cowhide, rawhide, etc. (See, e.g., col. 4, lines 56-60.)

In the aforementioned manner, Fisher provides an article with food value and chew-resistance to meet the needs of a dog. However, it is evident that the entire disclosure of Fisher relates to the requirements of a *dog* and not those of a *cat*, as is the subject of the presently claimed embodiments. Independent claims 1, 10 and 19 all recite that one or both of the outer shell and edible material include *catnip*, and that claim 21 similarly recites an *inducement*. The Final Action admits that Fisher fails to disclose a toy for a cat and an edible material including catnip. For this purpose, a combination with Smith is proposed who discloses a type of catnip toy. However, this proposed combination is entirely unmotivated. Since the entire disclosure of Fisher relates to a feeding system for a dog that meets the particular chewing needs of a dog, it is

readily apparent that such a product cannot be adapted for use with a cat, since it is well known that cats do not have the same teeth and jaw strength capabilities or chewing needs as a dog. There is no reason why one skilled in the art would seek to combine Fisher's dog feeding and chewing exercise system with Smith's catnip, since such a combination would result in an article that would not be chewable by a cat or a desirable by a dog and thus inoperable for all intents and purposes. Further, it is clear that a considerable amount of engineering and redesigning would be required to adapt Fisher's dog feeding system into an article suitable for chewing and consumption by cats, and that such efforts would go well beyond the disclosure of that reference. Thus, there can be no reasonable expectation of success in accordance with MPEP 2143.02.

The Final Action dismisses these difficulties in asserting the incorporation of Smith's catnip into Fisher's dog-related article, stating that:

...providing a specific single edible material which is known in the art would be merely a matter of obvious choice which is dependent upon the specific animal which the toy is made for, where MPEP 2144.07 states that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supports a prima facie obviousness determination. (Final Action, page 4, line 2 up through page 5, line 3.)

This contention is not well taken. Since the entire disclosure of Fisher relates to a food article for a dog, it is readily apparent that any "obvious choice" related to selecting a specific single edible material must be restricted to dogs, since surely there can be no motivation to incorporate catnip into a dog food item! Thus, there is surely no support for a prima facie obviousness determination under MPEP 2144.07 as contended in the Final Action.

It is readily apparent from the aforementioned discussion and from simple common sense that a combination of Fisher and Smith would not occur to one skilled in the art from reviewing these disclosures alone. One skilled in the art would need to be guided by the present disclosure as a 20/20 hindsight road map to the claimed subject matter. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination is unmotivated and thus a prima facie showing of obviousness has not in fact been established against the subject claims, as is clearly required by 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Furthermore, even if such a combination could somehow be contemplated, it would still

fail to meet all the requirements of the claimed subject matter. Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 each recite an *outer shell* and an *inner edible material* encased by the shell and including a *binding material*. Particularly, claim 1 recites an *underlying layer* comprising a *layer binding material* that **releases layer materials upon penetration**. Claim 10 recites that the binding material *provides consistency and rigidity, thereby resulting in a time release of the inner edible material accessible by the cat*. Claim 19 recites that the binding material *provides consistency and rigidity, so as to release inner edible material upon penetration*. In this way, it is clear that the claimed *binding material* and *edible material* are different materials such that the penetration of the binding material results in release of the edible material. However, in rejecting these limitations, the Final Action cites col. 4, lines 1-10. It is readily apparent from inspection that this passage does not include any such disclosure, but rather discusses “unit integrity” of the article while providing chewing exercise to the dog. It is however clear from the disclosure of Fisher that the cowhide and food are formed into a chewable mass that is consumed by the dog such that there is no “release of inner edible material upon penetration” as is recited in the subject claims. Thus, for at least this reason, the Fisher reference, taken alone or in combination with Smith, does not in fact disclose **each and every element** of the subject matter contended in the Final Action, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Additionally, claim 19 recites that the shell *maintains freshness of underlying material and that gradually wears away as the cat interacts therewith*. The Final Action contends that “maintaining freshness” is disclosed by Fisher at col. 4, lines 12-25. However, it is noted that this passage in fact lists a number of food components, indicating that “it is, in general, desirable that said food components have a satisfactory shelf-life so that preservation is no problem.” It is readily apparent that there is no discussion in this passage or elsewhere within the four corners of Fisher of a shell that “maintains freshness of underlying material,” as recited in independent claim 19. The Final Action also contends that “gradual wearing away” is disclosed at col. 1, lines 60-62. However, this passage simply states that chew-resistance is varied with the amount of structure-supporting fibers. Thus, for at least these reasons also, the Fisher reference, taken alone or in combination with Smith, does not in fact disclose **each and every element** of the subject matter contended in the Final Action, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In view of the aforementioned discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Fisher and Smith, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every aspect of the claims, and further, that the combination is unmotivated, thus failing to meet the requirements for a prima facie demonstration of obviousness. Accordingly, for least these reasons, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed, and that independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 21 be allowed, along with claims 2, 5-9, 13, 22-23, 25, and 27 that depend respectively therefrom.

A Declaration under 37 CFR § 1.132 was submitted in response to the Office Action of January 8, 2008, to present evidence of commercial success and also evidence of long-felt need for the claimed subject matter in the marketplace. The Declaration and evidence presented therewith was held, in the Final Action, to be not relevant to the issue of nonobviousness. The Final Action states:

Regarding applicant's declaration and the testimonials provided which speak to the novelty of the applicant's invention, it is noted that the statement (sic) amount to an *affirmation that the affiant has never seen the claimed subject matter before*. This is not relevant to the issue of nonobviousness of the claimed subject matter and provides no objective evidence thereof. See MPEP § 716. (Emphasis added.)

These statements are baseless and puzzling in that "affiant" is the present appellant who, as the inventor, has surely seen the claimed subject matter before! No detailed explanations are provided as to the reasons why the Declaration is insufficient, as required by MPEP 716, and these statements are therefore merely dismissive of the evidence presented in the Declaration.

The Declaration presents evidence of the commercial success. This issue is not in any way addressed in the Final Action. The claims had been amended to closely comport with the for-sale product so as to be commensurate in scope with the claims, to establish that the commercial success is directly derived from the invention claimed, in a marketplace where the consumer is free to choose on the basis of objective principles, and thus establish the nexus between the claimed invention and evidence of commercial success in accordance with MPEP 716.03, 716.03(a), 716.03(b).

To wit, the Declaration states that the product described in the present claims is currently being sold under the trade name “Pawbreakers” (hereinafter “the product”). The product is currently sold in almost every state in the USA and available through the PETCO chain, and is sold abroad through retail locations in Canada, Japan, Taiwan, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, and Poland. This represents significant progress and commercial success for appellant’s small business that offers a 100% American-made product. Further evidence of continuing commercial success can be inferred from the various testimonials in the Declaration, as quoted hereinbelow.

The Declaration also presented evidence of the long-felt need for the claimed subject matter in the marketplace. This evidence in the form of testimonials from veterinarians and well known authorities in the field indicates that for a long period of time there has been a need for a cat toy that engages a cat’s attention for a sustained period, and that other products in the field have not met the need as satisfactorily as has been done by the claimed subject matter, in accordance with MPEP 716.04.

For example, a testimonial was received from Franny Syufy, an award-winning member of the Cat Writers’ Association, who wrote that, *Brett Buchanan has proven again the old adage that “necessity is the mother of invention” with his Pawbreakers concept.* Franny’s testimonial indicates that appellant has solved the problem of containing catnip in a manner satisfying to cats. Franny notes that, *Pawbreakers were the result of countless hours of experimenting and testing on enthusiastic cats, until exactly the right shape and size was attained*, thereby observing other overall benefits and desirable properties of the claimed subject matter.

In another testimonial, Dr. Elizabeth Devitt, a writer for *PET AGE* magazine, observes that *Pawbreakers combine domestically grown catnip with a hypoallergenic binder into a long-lasting toy that cats actually can consume*, thereby acknowledging the innovative aspects of and the desirable results obtained from the claimed subject matter. In a further testimonial, Pam Johnson-Bennett, CABC, a well-known and popular expert on cat behavior, indicates that the claimed subject matter *could be a valuable tool for behavior modification* and that she would *like more behaviorists and other professionals to know about it.*

The testimonial evidence indicates that the actual structure of the claimed subject matter

provides solutions to long-noted problems in the areas of catnip toy manufacture and cat behavior modification. However, the Final Action is also dismissive of this evidence. Further, the Final Action states that:

[T]here is no evidence that if persons skilled in the art who were presumably working on the problem knew of the teachings of the above cited references, they would still be unable to solve the problem.

With regards to the prior art rejections in the Final Action, it is respectfully submitted that this statement is without basis. The Final Action relies on dog bone articles in combination with catnip, shown hereinabove to be unmotivated and failing to disclose each and every aspect of the claimed subject matter. It is further noted that the Office Action of January 8, 2008 that preceded the Final Action relied upon a similarly unlikely combination of cat toy articles.

For at least these reasons, it is again respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not overcome the aforementioned problems in the art from these references or any of the other feeble combinations of references offered throughout the prolonged prosecution of the present application. Accordingly, for least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rebuttal evidence of nonobviousness does in fact outweigh the alleged evidence of obviousness, and it is respectfully requested that rejection of Fisher and Smith be reversed, and that independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 21 be allowed, along with claims 2, 5-9, 13, 22-23, 25, and 27 that depend respectively therefrom.

C. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 21-23, 26, and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 21-23, 26, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baikie in view of Smith. Reversal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons:

- i. **Baikie and Smith, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 21-23, 26, and 27, which depend therefrom respectively; therefore, Baikie and Smith do not render unpatentable the present claims to one ordinarily skilled in the art.**
- ii. **The combination of Baikie and Smith is unmotivated and fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103.**
- iii. **The combination of Baikie and Smith is rebutted by evidence of commercial success and also evidence of long-felt need in the marketplace for the claimed subject matter.**

The Examiner relies on the structure of Baikie and Smith to reject the subject claims. However, the structure described in Baikie and Smith does not disclose or suggest the structure claimed in the present invention. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, 35 U.S.C. §103 requires that the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. See MPEP §706.02(j). The *teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination* and the reasonable expectation of success *must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure*. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added).

Baikie discloses a chew toy for dogs including a hollow bone that is cleaned and sterilized and then filled with a filling that includes a meat mixture and a mold inhibitor to prevent the possibility of mold growth on or in the toy. (See, e.g., col. 2, lines 1-64.) It is thus readily apparent that the Baikie reference can only be construed as meeting the needs of a *dog* and not those of a *cat*, as is the subject of the presently claimed embodiments. It is once again noted that independent claims 1, 10 and 19 all recite that one or both of the outer shell and edible material include *catnip*, and that claim 21 similarly recites an *inducement*. The Final Action admits that Baikie is silent with respect to disclosing a toy for a cat and an edible material including catnip. For this purpose, a combination with Smith is once again proposed who discloses a type of catnip toy.

As with the previous rejection, the proposed combination of Baikie and Smith is entirely

unmotivated. It is a fact drawn from common experience that dogs chew on bones, not cats, and that cats lack the teeth and jaw strength to chew and penetrate bones as do dogs. Since Baikie's hollow casing is an animal bone, it would defy all logic to suppose that this chew toy would be in any way suitable for a cat. Thus, it would be inexplicable to add catnip according to Smith to the hollow bone of Baikie. Such a combination would result in an article that would not be in any way chewable by a cat or of any interest to a dog. Such a combined article would therefore be inoperable for all intents and purposes, and no amount of engineering or redesigning could be contemplated that make a dog bone toy suitable for consumption by cats. Thus, there can be no reasonable expectation of success in accordance with MPEP 2143.02.

The Final Action again dismisses these difficulties in asserting the incorporation of Smith's catnip into Fisher's dog article, again stating that such a combination amounts to merely a matter of obvious choice! The contention is again made that such an obvious choice is dependent upon the specific animal which the toy is made for, again citing MPEP 2144.07 which states that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supports a prima facie obviousness determination. However, since a dog is the only specific animal for which this toy can be made, there is no suitability in selecting catnip for a dog bone chew toy. Therefore, based on the very reasoning supplied in the Final Action, there can be no prima facie obviousness determination.

It is again readily apparent from the aforementioned discussion and from simple common sense that a combination of Baikie and Smith would not occur to one skilled in the art from reviewing these disclosures alone, and that such would never occur to one skilled in the art without a hindsight reading of the subject disclosure. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination is unmotivated and that a prima facie showing of obviousness has not in fact been established against the subject claims, as is clearly required by 35 U.S.C. § 103.

It is further submitted that, even if such a combination could somehow be contemplated, it would still fail to meet all the requirements of the claimed subject matter. Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 each recite an *outer shell* and an *inner edible material* encased by the shell and including a *binding material*. In particular, claim 1 recites an *underlying layer* comprising a *layer binding material* that ***provides consistency to retain form and releases layer materials***

upon penetration. Claim 10 recites that the binding material *provides consistency and rigidity, thereby resulting in a time release of the inner edible material accessible by the cat*. Claim 19 recites that the binding material *provides consistency and rigidity, so as to release inner edible material upon penetration*. In this way, it is clear that the claimed *binding material* and *edible material* are different materials such that the penetration of the binding material results in release of the edible material.

However, in rejecting these limitations, the Final Action cites col. 2, lines 27-31. It is readily apparent from inspection that this passage does not include any such disclosure, but rather discusses that the filling increases interest from the dog as the dog attempts to extract the inside of the bone. There is no discussion of how this result is effected from any binding material. As to limitations of the binding material providing consistency to retain form, col. 2, lines 40-53 is cited which simply discloses steps in forming a premix of various ingredients that form a portion of the filling. A passage at col. 3, lines 16-24 is also cited, but this passage simply discloses cooling steps to change the filling from an aqueous to a gelatin consistency. In any event, it is clear from the disclosure of Baikie that the meat filling is a gelatinous mass and that there is no disclosure of a *binding material* that effects the “release of inner edible material upon penetration” as is recited in the subject claims. Thus, for at least these reasons, the Baikie reference, taken alone or in combination with Smith, does not in fact disclose *each and every element* of the subject matter contended in the Final Action, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Additionally, the Final Action variously states that Baikie discloses edible material which is released through one or more holes in the shell, that edible material is encased in a shell, and that edible material can be replaced through a hole in the outer shell, citing a passage from col. 3, lines 6-9 as allegedly disclosing all three of these various aspects. However, this passage actually states:

Bone 20 is then placed adjacent a free end 45 of tube 40, flow valve 42 is adjusted to its open position, and filling 30 is allowed to flow from holding vat 20 into inner region 22 of bone 20.

It is readily apparent that this passage simply discloses a one-time step of adding filling to the hollow bone. There is nothing disclosed or suggested in this passage or elsewhere within

the four corners of Baikie about *releasing, encasing, or replacing* edible material, as recited in the subject claims. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Final Action misconstrues this passage of the reference in all three instances. Thus, for at least this reason also, the Baikie reference, taken alone or in combination with Smith, does not in fact disclose *each and every element* of the subject matter contended in the Final Action, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In view of the aforementioned discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Fisher and Smith, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every aspect of the claims, and further, that the combination is unmotivated, thus failing to meet the requirements for a prima facie demonstration of obviousness. Accordingly, for least these reasons, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed, and that independent claims 1, 10, and 21 be allowed, along with claims 2, 5, 13, 15, 16, 22-23, 26, and 27 that depend respectively therefrom.

The Declaration under 37 CFR § 1.132 discussed hereinabove is also applicable to the rejection under Baikie and Smith. The evidence of commercial success and also evidence of long-felt need for the claimed subject matter in the marketplace and the supporting arguments presented hereinabove are reiterated and maintained as pertaining to the rejections of Baikie and Smith. For at least these reasons, it is again respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not overcome the aforementioned problems in the art from these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rebuttal evidence of nonobviousness does in fact outweigh the alleged evidence of obviousness, and it is respectfully requested that rejection of Baikie and Smith be reversed, and that independent claims 1, 10, and 21 be allowed, along with claims 2, 5, 13, 15, 16, 22-23, 26, and 27 that depend respectively therefrom.

Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21-23, and 25-27 be reversed.

In the event any additional fees may be due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3663 [BBUCP101USA]

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric Jorgenson, Reg.# 46,002/

Eric D. Jorgenson
Reg. No. 46,002

Law Office of Eric D. Jorgenson, Esq.
1457 King Road
Hinckley, Ohio 44233
Telephone (216) 225-4169
Facsimile (330) 278-3135

VIII. Appendix of Claims (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))

1. An edible toy for an animal, comprising:
a shell for oral interaction with the animal; and
at least one underlying layer formed of an edible material encased by the shell,
the toy is edible in its entirety;
wherein the at least one underlying layer comprises a layer binding material that
provides consistency to retain form, the binding material releases layer materials upon
penetration, and the edible material including catnip.
2. The toy of claim 1, wherein the edible material comprises at least one of an
inducement, a nutrient, or a treatment.
5. The toy of claim 1, wherein the edible material is accessed by at least one of the
cat biting the shell or clawing the shell.
6. The toy of claim 1, wherein the at least one underlying layer comprises multiple
layers of a plurality of different edible materials.
7. The toy of claim 6, wherein the multiple layers are formed concentrically about a
core material.
8. The toy of claim 1, wherein the shell includes at least one of an edible nodule or a
string affixed thereto.
9. The toy of claim 1, wherein the shell is compressed to a compression parameter
for a particular animal such that a lower compression parameter facilitates easier access to the
edible material and a higher compression parameter facilitates more difficult access to the edible
material.

10. An edible toy for a cat, comprising:
an outside shell for oral interaction with the cat, the shell comprises an edible material and catnip for stimulation of the cat to interact therewith; and
an inner edible material encased by the shell, the inner edible material comprises a binding material that provides consistency and rigidity, thereby resulting in a time release of the inner edible material accessible by the cat, the inner edible material made of edible components and catnip, wherein the entire toy is of edible material and thereby edible in its entirety.
13. The toy of claim 12, wherein the inner edible material is in the form of at least one of a liquid, a gel, a paste, or one or more edible objects.
15. The toy of claim 10, wherein the shell includes one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material therethrough to the cat.
16. The toy of claim 10, wherein the shell is flexible such that distortion thereof by the cat causes the inner edible material to be released to the cat.
19. An edible toy for a cat, comprising:
a shell for interaction by the cat, the shell made of an edible material that includes catnip, maintains freshness of underlying material and that gradually wears away as the cat interacts therewith; and
an inner edible material that is the underlying material and which is encased by the shell and accessible by the cat over an extended period of time, wherein the shell and inner edible material include an edible binding material that provides consistency and rigidity, so as to release inner edible material upon penetration, such that the toy is composed of edible material in its entirety.

21. A method of providing an edible toy for an animal, comprising:
providing an edible material;
providing a binding material that provides consistency to retain form;
mixing the edible material and binding material into a homogeneous mixture of
an inducement and at least one of a nutrient or a treatment;
forming an outer shell for housing the homogenous mixture; and
encasing the edible material within the outer shell.
22. The method of claim 21, wherein the edible material includes an inducement that stimulates the animal, which is a cat, to interact therewith.
23. The method of claim 22, further comprising compressing the shell and the edible material to a compression parameter that allows the cat to access the edible material via at least one of licking, biting, or clawing.
25. The method of claim 21, further comprising mixing the edible material such that a mixture of edible components thereof exhibit a marbling effect.
26. The method of claim 21, further comprising forming a hole in the outer shell such that the edible material can be replaced therethrough.
27. The method of claim 21, wherein the outer shell comprises the edible material.

IX. Appendix of Evidence (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))

Appended herewith on the following pages 20-25 is a copy of a Declaration Under 37 CFR § 1.132 that presents testimonial evidence in support of appellants position. The Declaration was submitted on May 2, 2008 in accompaniment with a Reply to the Office Action of January 8, 2008.

FIG. 1752,898 AT 5/20/08 10:58:11 AM [E:\BUCPI\BUCPI01\FIG. 1752,898] (C) 2008 BY INVENTOR, ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. DRAWING 1752,898-001

10/752,898

BBUCPI01USA

on the Advisory Board for Tree House Animal Foundation. Pam is Vice President of the International Association of Animal Behavior Consultants and Founder/Chair of the cat division. Pam asked the following questions, and user testimonials are included with the replies are provided thereafter:

1) What have veterinarians and/or behaviorists had to say specifically about this product?

I'm a veterinarian with the goal of becoming board certified in feline behavior. I think this product has a great deal of potential as environmental enrichment for cats, but I noticed something else as well. One of my cats is currently undergoing chemo and radiation therapy for a vaccination sarcoma (cancer). His appetite has been diminished lately, but after each play session with the Pawbreaker, he goes over and munches on cat food for a while. I noticed a definite difference in his attitude and appetite. -- Dr. Florsheim in Texas

I wanted to let you know I received the sample Pawbreakers and literature. As with some of your own customer comments, my oldest cat got into my mail bag and started smelling and poking at the box until she got it out and knocked it onto the floor. Then the other cat joined in. They both enjoyed them. I've looked at your website and have copied the stores where they are available here in Massachusetts so I can refer my clients in my behavioral practice to them. You've created the perfect toy/treat. -- Dr. Bette Armstrong

2) Have you had any feedback from customers or professionals who found the product helped with any behavior problems? -- not just positive comments that they liked the product, but specific information about the benefits for addressing behavior issues such as separation anxiety, depression, compulsive behavior, fear, etc.

Being kitty people yourself you know that cats can be very finicky about everything. My one kitty I found in a parking lot and he had trouble adjusting to a life indoors with people who care. He wouldn't play with any toys I introduced to him and would shy away from any physical contact. However, the one toy he absolutely could not pass up is your catnip balls! He goes crazy! Now he plays and loves all kinds of attention. My other kitty also goes nuts over them and she is as finicky as they come! I always have to make sure they each have their own or a fight will surely break out. Crazy felines. -- T. Hartwick

I ordered some just a couple of weeks ago and had them shipped to my Morns for Christmas...I was at Mom's over the weekend and her cat and mine were

FIG. 10
 FIG. 11
 FIG. 12
 FIG. 13
 FIG. 14
 FIG. 15
 FIG. 16
 FIG. 17
 FIG. 18
 FIG. 19
 FIG. 20
 FIG. 21
 FIG. 22
 FIG. 23
 FIG. 24
 FIG. 25
 FIG. 26
 FIG. 27
 FIG. 28
 FIG. 29
 FIG. 30
 FIG. 31
 FIG. 32
 FIG. 33
 FIG. 34
 FIG. 35
 FIG. 36
 FIG. 37
 FIG. 38
 FIG. 39
 FIG. 40
 FIG. 41
 FIG. 42
 FIG. 43
 FIG. 44
 FIG. 45
 FIG. 46
 FIG. 47
 FIG. 48
 FIG. 49
 FIG. 50
 FIG. 51
 FIG. 52
 FIG. 53
 FIG. 54
 FIG. 55
 FIG. 56
 FIG. 57
 FIG. 58
 FIG. 59
 FIG. 60
 FIG. 61
 FIG. 62
 FIG. 63
 FIG. 64
 FIG. 65
 FIG. 66
 FIG. 67
 FIG. 68
 FIG. 69
 FIG. 70
 FIG. 71
 FIG. 72
 FIG. 73
 FIG. 74
 FIG. 75
 FIG. 76
 FIG. 77
 FIG. 78
 FIG. 79
 FIG. 80
 FIG. 81
 FIG. 82
 FIG. 83
 FIG. 84
 FIG. 85
 FIG. 86
 FIG. 87
 FIG. 88
 FIG. 89
 FIG. 90
 FIG. 91
 FIG. 92
 FIG. 93
 FIG. 94
 FIG. 95
 FIG. 96
 FIG. 97
 FIG. 98
 FIG. 99
 FIG. 100
 FIG. 101
 FIG. 102
 FIG. 103
 FIG. 104
 FIG. 105
 FIG. 106
 FIG. 107
 FIG. 108
 FIG. 109
 FIG. 110
 FIG. 111
 FIG. 112
 FIG. 113
 FIG. 114
 FIG. 115
 FIG. 116
 FIG. 117
 FIG. 118
 FIG. 119
 FIG. 120
 FIG. 121
 FIG. 122
 FIG. 123
 FIG. 124
 FIG. 125
 FIG. 126
 FIG. 127
 FIG. 128
 FIG. 129
 FIG. 130
 FIG. 131
 FIG. 132
 FIG. 133
 FIG. 134
 FIG. 135
 FIG. 136
 FIG. 137
 FIG. 138
 FIG. 139
 FIG. 140
 FIG. 141
 FIG. 142
 FIG. 143
 FIG. 144
 FIG. 145
 FIG. 146
 FIG. 147
 FIG. 148
 FIG. 149
 FIG. 150
 FIG. 151
 FIG. 152
 FIG. 153
 FIG. 154
 FIG. 155
 FIG. 156
 FIG. 157
 FIG. 158
 FIG. 159
 FIG. 160
 FIG. 161
 FIG. 162
 FIG. 163
 FIG. 164
 FIG. 165
 FIG. 166
 FIG. 167
 FIG. 168
 FIG. 169
 FIG. 170
 FIG. 171
 FIG. 172
 FIG. 173
 FIG. 174
 FIG. 175
 FIG. 176
 FIG. 177
 FIG. 178
 FIG. 179
 FIG. 180
 FIG. 181
 FIG. 182
 FIG. 183
 FIG. 184
 FIG. 185
 FIG. 186
 FIG. 187
 FIG. 188
 FIG. 189
 FIG. 190
 FIG. 191
 FIG. 192
 FIG. 193
 FIG. 194
 FIG. 195
 FIG. 196
 FIG. 197
 FIG. 198
 FIG. 199
 FIG. 200
 FIG. 201
 FIG. 202
 FIG. 203
 FIG. 204
 FIG. 205
 FIG. 206
 FIG. 207
 FIG. 208
 FIG. 209
 FIG. 210
 FIG. 211
 FIG. 212
 FIG. 213
 FIG. 214
 FIG. 215
 FIG. 216
 FIG. 217
 FIG. 218
 FIG. 219
 FIG. 220
 FIG. 221
 FIG. 222
 FIG. 223
 FIG. 224
 FIG. 225
 FIG. 226
 FIG. 227
 FIG. 228
 FIG. 229
 FIG. 230
 FIG. 231
 FIG. 232
 FIG. 233
 FIG. 234
 FIG. 235
 FIG. 236
 FIG. 237
 FIG. 238
 FIG. 239
 FIG. 240
 FIG. 241
 FIG. 242
 FIG. 243
 FIG. 244
 FIG. 245
 FIG. 246
 FIG. 247
 FIG. 248
 FIG. 249
 FIG. 250
 FIG. 251
 FIG. 252
 FIG. 253
 FIG. 254
 FIG. 255
 FIG. 256
 FIG. 257
 FIG. 258
 FIG. 259
 FIG. 260
 FIG. 261
 FIG. 262
 FIG. 263
 FIG. 264
 FIG. 265
 FIG. 266
 FIG. 267
 FIG. 268
 FIG. 269
 FIG. 270
 FIG. 271
 FIG. 272
 FIG. 273
 FIG. 274
 FIG. 275
 FIG. 276
 FIG. 277
 FIG. 278
 FIG. 279
 FIG. 280
 FIG. 281
 FIG. 282
 FIG. 283
 FIG. 284
 FIG. 285
 FIG. 286
 FIG. 287
 FIG. 288
 FIG. 289
 FIG. 290
 FIG. 291
 FIG. 292
 FIG. 293
 FIG. 294
 FIG. 295
 FIG. 296
 FIG. 297
 FIG. 298
 FIG. 299
 FIG. 300
 FIG. 301
 FIG. 302
 FIG. 303
 FIG. 304
 FIG. 305
 FIG. 306
 FIG. 307
 FIG. 308
 FIG. 309
 FIG. 310
 FIG. 311
 FIG. 312
 FIG. 313
 FIG. 314
 FIG. 315
 FIG. 316
 FIG. 317
 FIG. 318
 FIG. 319
 FIG. 320
 FIG. 321
 FIG. 322
 FIG. 323
 FIG. 324
 FIG. 325
 FIG. 326
 FIG. 327
 FIG. 328
 FIG. 329
 FIG. 330
 FIG. 331
 FIG. 332
 FIG. 333
 FIG. 334
 FIG. 335
 FIG. 336
 FIG. 337
 FIG. 338
 FIG. 339
 FIG. 340
 FIG. 341
 FIG. 342
 FIG. 343
 FIG. 344
 FIG. 345
 FIG. 346
 FIG. 347
 FIG. 348
 FIG. 349
 FIG. 350
 FIG. 351
 FIG. 352
 FIG. 353
 FIG. 354
 FIG. 355
 FIG. 356
 FIG. 357
 FIG. 358
 FIG. 359
 FIG. 360
 FIG. 361
 FIG. 362
 FIG. 363
 FIG. 364
 FIG. 365
 FIG. 366
 FIG. 367
 FIG. 368
 FIG. 369
 FIG. 370
 FIG. 371
 FIG. 372
 FIG. 373
 FIG. 374
 FIG. 375
 FIG. 376
 FIG. 377
 FIG. 378
 FIG. 379
 FIG. 380
 FIG. 381
 FIG. 382
 FIG. 383
 FIG. 384
 FIG. 385
 FIG. 386
 FIG. 387
 FIG. 388
 FIG. 389
 FIG. 390
 FIG. 391
 FIG. 392
 FIG. 393
 FIG. 394
 FIG. 395
 FIG. 396
 FIG. 397
 FIG. 398
 FIG. 399
 FIG. 400
 FIG. 401
 FIG. 402
 FIG. 403
 FIG. 404
 FIG. 405
 FIG. 406
 FIG. 407
 FIG. 408
 FIG. 409
 FIG. 410
 FIG. 411
 FIG. 412
 FIG. 413
 FIG. 414
 FIG. 415
 FIG. 416
 FIG. 417
 FIG. 418
 FIG. 419
 FIG. 420
 FIG. 421
 FIG. 422
 FIG. 423
 FIG. 424
 FIG. 425
 FIG. 426
 FIG. 427
 FIG. 428
 FIG. 429
 FIG. 430
 FIG. 431
 FIG. 432
 FIG. 433
 FIG. 434
 FIG. 435
 FIG. 436
 FIG. 437
 FIG. 438
 FIG. 439
 FIG. 440
 FIG. 441
 FIG. 442
 FIG. 443
 FIG. 444
 FIG. 445
 FIG. 446
 FIG. 447
 FIG. 448
 FIG. 449
 FIG. 450
 FIG. 451
 FIG. 452
 FIG. 453
 FIG. 454
 FIG. 455
 FIG. 456
 FIG. 457
 FIG. 458
 FIG. 459
 FIG. 460
 FIG. 461
 FIG. 462
 FIG. 463
 FIG. 464
 FIG. 465
 FIG. 466
 FIG. 467
 FIG. 468
 FIG. 469
 FIG. 470
 FIG. 471
 FIG. 472
 FIG. 473
 FIG. 474
 FIG. 475
 FIG. 476
 FIG. 477
 FIG. 478
 FIG. 479
 FIG. 480
 FIG. 481
 FIG. 482
 FIG. 483
 FIG. 484
 FIG. 485
 FIG. 486
 FIG. 487
 FIG. 488
 FIG. 489
 FIG. 490
 FIG. 491
 FIG. 492
 FIG. 493
 FIG. 494
 FIG. 495
 FIG. 496
 FIG. 497
 FIG. 498
 FIG. 499
 FIG. 500
 FIG. 501
 FIG. 502
 FIG. 503
 FIG. 504
 FIG. 505
 FIG. 506
 FIG. 507
 FIG. 508
 FIG. 509
 FIG. 510
 FIG. 511
 FIG. 512
 FIG. 513
 FIG. 514
 FIG. 515
 FIG. 516
 FIG. 517
 FIG. 518
 FIG. 519
 FIG. 520
 FIG. 521
 FIG. 522
 FIG. 523
 FIG. 524
 FIG. 525
 FIG. 526
 FIG. 527
 FIG. 528
 FIG. 529
 FIG. 530
 FIG. 531
 FIG. 532
 FIG. 533
 FIG. 534
 FIG. 535
 FIG. 536
 FIG. 537
 FIG. 538
 FIG. 539
 FIG. 540
 FIG. 541
 FIG. 542
 FIG. 543
 FIG. 544
 FIG. 545
 FIG. 546
 FIG. 547
 FIG. 548
 FIG. 549
 FIG. 550
 FIG. 551
 FIG. 552
 FIG. 553
 FIG. 554
 FIG. 555
 FIG. 556
 FIG. 557
 FIG. 558
 FIG. 559
 FIG. 560
 FIG. 561
 FIG. 562
 FIG. 563
 FIG. 564
 FIG. 565
 FIG. 566
 FIG. 567
 FIG. 568
 FIG. 569
 FIG. 570
 FIG. 571
 FIG. 572
 FIG. 573
 FIG. 574
 FIG. 575
 FIG. 576
 FIG. 577
 FIG. 578
 FIG. 579
 FIG. 580
 FIG. 581
 FIG. 582
 FIG. 583
 FIG. 584
 FIG. 585
 FIG. 586
 FIG. 587
 FIG. 588
 FIG. 589
 FIG. 590
 FIG. 591
 FIG. 592
 FIG. 593
 FIG. 594
 FIG. 595
 FIG. 596
 FIG. 597
 FIG. 598
 FIG. 599
 FIG. 600
 FIG. 601
 FIG. 602
 FIG. 603
 FIG. 604
 FIG. 605
 FIG. 606
 FIG. 607
 FIG. 608
 FIG. 609
 FIG. 610
 FIG. 611
 FIG. 612
 FIG. 613
 FIG. 614
 FIG. 615
 FIG. 616
 FIG. 617
 FIG. 618
 FIG. 619
 FIG. 620
 FIG. 621
 FIG. 622
 FIG. 623
 FIG. 624
 FIG. 625
 FIG. 626
 FIG. 627
 FIG. 628
 FIG. 629
 FIG. 630
 FIG. 631
 FIG. 632
 FIG. 633
 FIG. 634
 FIG. 635
 FIG. 636
 FIG. 637
 FIG. 638
 FIG. 639
 FIG. 640
 FIG. 641
 FIG. 642
 FIG. 643
 FIG. 644
 FIG. 645
 FIG. 646
 FIG. 647
 FIG. 648
 FIG. 649
 FIG. 650
 FIG. 651
 FIG. 652
 FIG. 653
 FIG. 654
 FIG. 655
 FIG. 656
 FIG. 657
 FIG. 658
 FIG. 659
 FIG. 660
 FIG. 661
 FIG. 662
 FIG. 663
 FIG. 664
 FIG. 665
 FIG. 666
 FIG. 667
 FIG. 668
 FIG. 669
 FIG. 670
 FIG. 671
 FIG. 672
 FIG. 673
 FIG. 674
 FIG. 675
 FIG. 676
 FIG. 677
 FIG. 678
 FIG. 679
 FIG. 680
 FIG. 681
 FIG. 682
 FIG. 683
 FIG. 684
 FIG. 685
 FIG. 686
 FIG. 687
 FIG. 688
 FIG. 689
 FIG. 690
 FIG. 691
 FIG. 692
 FIG. 693
 FIG. 694
 FIG. 695
 FIG. 696
 FIG. 697
 FIG. 698
 FIG. 699
 FIG. 700
 FIG. 701
 FIG. 702
 FIG. 703
 FIG. 704
 FIG. 705
 FIG. 706
 FIG. 707
 FIG. 708
 FIG. 709
 FIG. 710
 FIG. 711
 FIG. 712
 FIG. 713
 FIG. 714
 FIG. 715
 FIG. 716
 FIG. 717
 FIG. 718
 FIG. 719
 FIG. 720
 FIG. 721
 FIG. 722
 FIG. 723
 FIG. 724
 FIG. 725
 FIG. 726
 FIG. 727
 FIG. 728
 FIG. 729
 FIG. 730
 FIG. 731
 FIG. 732
 FIG. 733
 FIG. 734
 FIG. 735
 FIG. 736
 FIG. 737
 FIG. 738
 FIG. 739
 FIG. 740
 FIG. 741
 FIG. 742
 FIG. 743
 FIG. 744
 FIG. 745
 FIG. 746
 FIG. 747
 FIG. 748
 FIG. 749
 FIG. 750
 FIG. 751
 FIG. 752
 FIG. 753
 FIG. 754
 FIG. 755
 FIG. 756
 FIG. 757
 FIG. 758
 FIG. 759
 FIG. 760
 FIG. 761
 FIG. 762
 FIG. 763
 FIG. 764
 FIG. 765
 FIG. 766
 FIG. 767
 FIG. 768
 FIG. 769
 FIG. 770
 FIG. 771
 FIG. 772
 FIG. 773
 FIG. 774
 FIG. 775
 FIG. 776
 FIG. 777
 FIG. 778
 FIG. 779
 FIG. 780
 FIG. 781
 FIG. 782
 FIG. 783
 FIG. 784
 FIG. 785
 FIG. 786
 FIG. 787
 FIG. 788
 FIG. 789
 FIG. 790
 FIG. 791
 FIG. 792
 FIG. 793
 FIG. 794
 FIG. 795
 FIG. 796
 FIG. 797
 FIG. 798
 FIG. 799
 FIG. 800
 FIG. 801
 FIG. 802
 FIG. 803
 FIG. 804
 FIG. 805
 FIG. 806
 FIG. 807
 FIG. 808
 FIG. 809
 FIG. 810
 FIG. 811
 FIG. 812
 FIG. 813
 FIG. 814
 FIG. 815
 FIG. 816
 FIG. 817
 FIG. 818
 FIG. 819
 FIG. 820
 FIG. 821
 FIG. 822
 FIG. 823
 FIG. 824
 FIG. 825
 FIG. 826
 FIG. 827
 FIG. 828
 FIG. 829
 FIG. 830
 FIG. 831
 FIG. 832
 FIG. 833
 FIG. 834
 FIG. 835
 FIG. 836
 FIG. 837
 FIG. 838
 FIG. 839
 FIG. 840
 FIG. 841
 FIG. 842
 FIG. 843
 FIG. 844
 FIG. 845
 FIG. 846
 FIG. 847
 FIG. 848
 FIG. 849
 FIG. 850
 FIG. 851
 FIG. 852
 FIG. 853
 FIG. 854
 FIG. 855
 FIG. 856
 FIG. 857
 FIG. 858
 FIG. 859
 FIG. 860
 FIG. 861
 FIG. 862
 FIG. 863
 FIG. 864
 FIG. 865
 FIG. 866
 FIG. 867
 FIG. 868
 FIG. 869
 FIG. 870
 FIG. 871
 FIG. 872
 FIG. 873
 FIG. 874
 FIG. 875
 FIG. 876
 FIG. 877
 FIG. 878
 FIG. 879
 FIG. 880
 FIG. 881
 FIG. 882
 FIG. 883
 FIG. 884
 FIG. 885
 FIG. 886
 FIG. 887
 FIG. 888
 FIG. 889
 FIG. 890
 FIG. 891
 FIG. 892
 FIG. 893
 FIG. 894
 FIG. 895
 FIG. 896
 FIG. 897
 FIG. 898
 FIG. 899
 FIG. 900
 FIG. 901
 FIG. 902
 FIG. 903
 FIG. 904
 FIG. 905
 FIG. 906
 FIG. 907
 FIG. 908
 FIG. 909
 FIG. 910
 FIG. 911
 FIG. 912
 FIG. 913
 FIG. 914
 FIG. 915
 FIG. 916
 FIG. 917
 FIG. 918
 FIG. 919
 FIG. 920
 FIG. 921
 FIG. 922
 FIG. 923
 FIG. 924
 FIG. 925
 FIG. 926
 FIG. 927
 FIG. 928
 FIG. 929
 FIG. 930
 FIG. 931
 FIG. 932
 FIG. 933
 FIG. 934
 FIG. 935
 FIG. 936
 FIG. 937
 FIG. 938
 FIG. 939
 FIG. 940
 FIG. 941
 FIG. 942
 FIG. 943
 FIG. 944
 FIG. 945
 FIG. 946
 FIG. 947
 FIG. 948
 FIG. 949
 FIG. 950
 FIG. 951
 FIG. 952
 FIG. 953
 FIG. 954
 FIG. 955
 FIG. 956
 FIG. 957
 FIG. 958
 FIG. 959
 FIG. 960
 FIG. 961
 FIG. 962
 FIG. 963
 FIG. 964
 FIG. 965
 FIG. 966
 FIG. 967
 FIG. 968
 FIG. 969
 FIG. 970
 FIG. 971
 FIG. 972
 FIG. 973
 FIG. 974
 FIG. 975
 FIG. 976
 FIG. 977
 FIG. 978
 FIG. 979
 FIG. 980
 FIG. 981
 FIG. 982
 FIG. 983
 FIG. 984
 FIG. 985
 FIG. 986
 FIG. 987
 FIG. 988
 FIG. 989
 FIG. 990
 FIG. 991
 FIG. 992
 FIG. 993
 FIG. 994
 FIG. 995
 FIG. 996
 FIG. 997
 FIG. 998
 FIG. 999
 FIG. 1000

10/752,898

BBUCPI01USA

squabbling, so I broke out the Pawbreakers and gave them each one. All was forgiven as both cats went nuts...will need some more as I plan on shipping a couple off to friends with their Christmas presents...and I sure don't want to run out here at home! - D. Sharples

My cats, Dari & Alex, have recently discovered the joys of Pawbreaker heaven.... Thank you SO MUCH for making this wonderfully entertaining product! These gentlemen, both 15 years old, have "never" expressed an interest in ANY particular toy, or in catnip at all, until I found Pawbreakers" - R. Wilken

Statistics:

The following statistics were compiled from hundreds of product testers in the USA and worldwide before introducing Pawbreakers to the public.

- 1) 9 out of 10 testers had positive reactions to the product
- 2) 8 out of 10 cats reacted immediately
- 3) 7 out of 10 cats played with this toy more than any other toy.

ever!

3) *What is the availability of the product overall? What are the future plans for availability? -- The reason I ask this is that I don't include product information in my books if the product has very limited availability.*

We hope to have Pawbreakers available to customers around the world...currently we are in almost every state in the USA and growing rapidly (many locations have not been updated on our website, sorry...that should happen soon). Customers can order anytime on the web at www.pawbreakers.com. Shipping is included in the USA, Canada and Mexico...or, they can also find them at their local PETCO.

We also ship directly to customers around the world and we have retail locations in Canada, Japan, Taiwan, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, Poland and other locations around the world.

Please also note that Pawbreakers are also a 100% USA made product

Pam Johnson-Bennett replied with the following statement:

I think the idea of your product is outstanding and if it performs as claimed on your website, it could be a valuable tool for behavior modification and I'd like more behaviorists and other professionals to know about it.

PAGE 19/20 • RCVD AT 5/2/2008 10:08:11 AM (Eastern Daylight Time) • SVR:USPTO-ETXRF-01 • DMS:27/30300 • CSD:300 278 3135 • DURATION (mm-ss):04:29

BBUCP101USA

10/752,898

8) I believe that all statements made herein of my knowledge are true, and believe that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further, that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements and the like so made may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing therefrom.

DECLARANT:

Date: May 1, 2008

Brett Buchanan
Brett J. Buchanan

- X. **Related Proceedings Appendix (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(x))**
 (None)